

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,094	07/01/2003	Isaac Weiser	03-11987	5817
25189 75	590 06/02/2006		EXAM	INER
CISLO & THOMAS, LLP			GARCIA, ERNESTO	
233 WILSHIRE	E BLVD		ART UNIT	
SUITE 900	SUITE 900			PAPER NUMBER
SANTA MONICA, CA 90401-1211			3679	
			DATE MAILED: 06/02/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/612,094	WEISER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ernesto Garcia	3679				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 M</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E.	action is non-final.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-16 is/are pending in the approach 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3 and 12-16 is/are solution 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 4-7 and 9-11 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers	withdrawn from consideration.					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	,				

DB

DETAILED ACTION

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Restriction

Claims 1-3 and 12-16 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicants timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on November 1, 2004.

In respect to the additional restriction between the novelty system and the method of constructing the novelty mailed on 1/23/2006, the restriction has been withdrawn because the method has been amended to a kit for making the novelty assembly as claimed. Accordingly, system and the kit in the amendment received on 3/09/06 have been examined.

Claim Objections

Claims 4 and 10 are objected to because of the following informalities:

regarding claim 4, the first occurrence of "said" in line 12 should be --a--, and --of said post-- should be inserted after "end" in line 12; and,

regarding claim 10, --one of-- should be after "to" in line 7, and "structure" in line 7 should be --structures--.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 4 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higdon, 5,375,363, in view of Moore et al., 5,716,161.

Regarding claim 4, Higdon discloses, in Figures 5, 6, and 10, a body 12, an appendage 16, and a connecting structure 354. The body 12 has apertures 366 (Fig. 10), A1 (see Figure 6 in the marked-up attachment provided in the last Office action). The appendage 16 corresponds to one of the apertures 366. The appendage 16 includes at least one flexible connecting member 30. The connecting member 30 comprises a coil spring. The connecting structure 354 comprises a post A2 (see marked-up attachment; Figure 5) with prongs 364 (Fig. 10) flexibly coupled to the first end of the post. The prongs 364 extend toward the body 12. One end of the flexible connecting member 30 is connected to the connecting structure 354 and another end of the connecting member 30 is connected to the appendage 16. However, the prongs 364 do not extend away from the post and toward a second end of the post.

Page 4

Moore et al. teach in Figure 5 prongs that extend away from a post 40 and toward a second end of the post 40 to manually install a connecting structure to apertures and quickly remove the connecting structure from the apertures without using tools (col. 1, lines 33-40. Therefore, as taught by Moore et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the prongs of Higdon with the prongs of Moore et al. to manually install the connecting structure of Higdon to the apertures and quickly remove the connecting structure of Higdon from the apertures without using tools.

Regarding claim 9, the connecting member 30 has a spring constant that allows the appendage 16 to be freely movable with respect to the body responsive to wind.

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higdon, 5,375,363, in view of Moore et al., 5,716,161, as applied to claims 4 and 9, and further in view of Wiser et al., 6,599,160.

Regarding claim 5, Higdon, as discussed, fails to disclose the one appendage comprising a wing structure. Weiser et al. teach an appendage comprising a wing structure to make a decoy as close to impart life-like movement to a bird. Therefore, as taught by Weiser et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the one appendage comprise a wing structure to make the goose of Higdon life-like.

Regarding claim 6, Higdon, as modified, discloses the connecting structure **354** includes a second end **56** to connect to the appendage **16**.

Regarding claim 7, Higdon, as modified, discloses the appendage **16** comprises an enclosure **48** configured to secure to the second end **56** of the connecting structure **354**.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiser et al., 6,599,160, and further in view of Higdon, 5,375,363.

Regarding claim 10, Wiser et al. disclose, in Figure 2, a kit comprising detached novelty portions 4,10,12. The novelty portions comprise a body 4 and appendages 10,12. The body 4 has apertures 16. The appendages 10,12 include at least one flexible connecting member 14 comprising a coil spring extending therefrom. The appendages 10,12 are secured upon assembly. However, the kit fails to include connecting structures. Higdon teaches, in Figure 10, a kit having a connecting structure 354 to connect an appendage 316 to a body 312, and the connecting structure comprising prongs 364 flexibly coupled to a first end of the connecting structure. However, Higdon fails to disclose more than one connecting structure. Applicant should not that the courts have held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include more than one connecting structure in the kit of Wiser et al. to connect the appendages to the body instead of extending the coil spring through the body (see Weiser et al.; col. 4, lines 7-16). *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8. Given the duplication of the connecting structure, each of the connecting structures will comprise prongs flexibly coupled to the first end of each connecting structure.

Regarding claim 11, given the modification, the connecting structures will be inserted into the apertures instead of the coil springs extending through the body.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Del Mas, 2,760,303, in view of Higdon, 5,375,363.

Regarding claim 10, Del Mas discloses, in Figure 3, a kit comprising detached novelty portions 10,36. The novelty portions comprise a body 10 and appendages 61. The body 10 has apertures 15. The appendages 61 include at least one flexible connecting member 56 comprising a coil spring extending therefrom. The appendages 61 are securable upon assembly. The kit further includes connecting structures 16. One end of the flexible connecting member 56 to one of the connecting structures 16.

However, Del Mas fails to disclose the post comprising prongs flexibly coupled to a first end of the post, and the prongs extending towards the body to terminate at

respective termini Higdon teaches, in Figure 10, a kit having a connecting structure 354, and the connecting structure 354 comprising prongs 364 flexibly coupled to a first end of the connecting structure 354 to extend towards the body 312 to terminate at respective termini in order to connect an appendage 316 to a body 312 without using tools and to manually disconnect the appendage. Therefore, as taught by Higdon, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide each of the connecting structures with prongs flexibly coupled to a first end of one of the connecting structure to manually connect the appendages to the body without using tools.

Regarding claim 11, the connecting structures 16 are insertable into the apertures.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 4-7 and 9-11 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to Weiser et al., applicants have not disqualified the reference. The fact that the reference and the application have the same assignee is <u>not</u>, by itself, sufficient evidence to disqualify the prior art under 35 U.S.C. **103**(c). There must be a statement that the common ownership was "at the time the invention was made."

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. In particular, the new limitations "the plurality of prongs extending away from said post and toward said second end" recited in claim 4, lines 11-12, and "each said connecting structure comprising" recited in claim 10, lines 11-12, necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ernesto Garcia whose telephone number is 571-272-

Application/Control Number: 10/612,094

Art Unit: 3679

70837083. The examiner can normally be reached from 9:30-6:00. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Daniel P. Stodola can be reached at 571-272-7087.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

E.G.

May 26, 2006

DANIEL P. STODOLA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Daniel P Stodola

Page 9